DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 288 UD 027 973

TITLE	Evaluating Schoolwide Projects.
INSTITUTION	Advanced Technology, Inc., Indianapolis, IN.; Chapter 1 Technical Assistance Center, Indianapolis, IN. Region B.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC. Compensatory Education Programs.
REPORT NO	TAC-B-91
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	11p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Advanced Technology, Inc., 2601 Fortune Circle East, Suite 300A, Indianapolis, IN 46241.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Achievement Gains; *Data Analysis; *Data Collection; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Federal Programs; *Outcomes of Education; *Program Evaluation; School Districts; Summative Evaluation; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

This document outlines requirements for evaluating schoolwide projects funded under Title I Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1975. The following school-level requirements must be met on a school by school basis: (1) demonstrate the aggregate achievement gains of all disadvantaged students in grades 2-12; (2) examine student-level achievement gains and modify the program accordingly; (3) monitor and assess the attainment of desired outcomes at all grade levels; and (4) conduct an annual review. District-level requirements include examining the academic achievement of students in the regular program and conducting a sustained effects study every three years. A summative evaluation must be conducted at the end of the third project year comparing the achievement gains attained in grades 2-12 by the schoolwide project to the achievement gains of either other disadvantaged students in the district that same year, or to the achievement gains of disadvantaged students in the same school for the 3 years prior to the initiation of the project. The following materials are appended: (1) a guide for determining project years; (2) two examples of determining "comparable data" for evaluation purposes; (3) two forms for defining the basis of the achievement gain comparison; (4) an example of the calculation of average achievement gains; and (5) the requirements for demonstrating desired outcomes. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TAC-B-91

Sheila

UD

ED334288

Evaluating

Schoolwide Projects

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented by:

UD 027 973

EMKART ATI

Advanced Technology Inc. / 2601 Fortune Circle East / Indianapolis, IN 46241
Telephone 800-456-2380 / 317-244-8160

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATING SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

Meet the requirements of all Chapter 1 programs

School-level requirements on a school by school basis.

1. *Aggregate gains* for all educationally disadvantaged students in grades 2 to 12 from Spring of the year prior to project implementation to Spring of the first project year:

   - o record total reading and total math scores in NCEs and compute gain or loss
   - o identify children separately who are educationally deprived based on reading and math scores. Those below the 50th NCE in Spring of the year prior to project implementation are counted.
   - o average the gains of educationally deprived children only. Hint: Sum the gains separately from the losses. Subtract the total losses from the total gains and divide by the number of scores in both groups.

2. Look at *student level gains:*

   - o for last year's students
   - o make program modifications for children who didn't gain

3. Monitor and assess *attainment of desired outcomes* at all grade levels using the criteria established for "substantial progress." Set up school data bases for each outcome in your schoolwide project application.

4. Conduct *annual review* of data in 1, 2, and 3 and disseminate the information to parents, teachers and others.

Contribute data to meet *district-level requirements*

5. Look at *performance in the regular program*.

6. Conduct *sustained effects study* every three years.

Carry out *special schoolwide project evaluation requirement*

7. Conduct a summative evaluation at the end of the third project year.

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

At the end of the third project year a comparison must be made between the gains attained in Grades 2-12 by the schoolwide project and the gains attained by either:

- o the other Chapter 1 students in the district that same year ("other schools" comparison); or
- o the Chapter 1 students in the same school for the three years prior to the initiation of the schoolwide project ("same school" comparison).

Most schoolwide projects have chosen the latter comparison. Since this choice requires the use of data collected over a six-year period (years -3, -2, -1, and +3) it is important during the first project year to assess the feasibility of obtaining *quality data* on *comparable groups*. If all of the following questions have positive answers, then the "same school" comparison is feasible.

1. Did all or most grades in the school receive Chapter 1 services in *all* three years prior to the beginning of the schoolwide project?

2. Will the same test be given in the third project year as was used for the three years prior to the beginning of schoolwide projects? (If not, was a different edition of the *same* test given?)

3. Are data available on at least half of the children served each year prior to implementation of the schoolwide project?

4. Were these data collected using an annual testing cycle (e.g. spring to spring)? If not, can annual data be retrieved from student records?

5. Is it feasible in terms of time and resources available you and access to records of students no longer in the school to construct a data base for the three years prior to schoolwide project implementation?

ONLY IF THERE ARE SATISFACTORY ANSWERS TO THESE QUESTIONS SHOULD THE "SAME SCHOOL" COMPARISON BE ATTEMPTED.

Guide for Determining Project Years by Year in Which Schoolwide Project Began

	Schoolwide project is implemented in 1989-90 school year.	Schoolwide project is implemented in 1990-91 school year.
Year -3	1986-87	1987-88
Year -2	1987-88	1988-89
Year -1	1988-89	1989-90
Year +1	1989-90	1990-91
Year +2	1990-91	1991-92
Year +3	1991-92	1992-93

Note: *It may be helpful to write the appropriate years in place of Year -3 to Year +3 on the attached pages.*

What are "comparable data" for purposes of evaluating a schoolwide project?

The two sets of data for comparing the gains of children in a schoolwide project in its third year to the gains of a comparison group need to be alike in terms of:

- the grades of the children included
- the pretest cutoff for children included
- the testing interval used (fall-spring or annual)
- the reasons for which children were excluded from the dataset

Example 1:

A Chapter 1 school served the following children

Year -3 - Grades 1-6 reading, children up to 30th %ile
Year -3 - Grades 4-6 math, children up to 25th %ile
Year -2 - Grades 1-4 reading, children up to 35th %ile
Year -2 - Grades 4-5 math, children up to 30th %ile
Year -1 - Same as Year -2

Now the school has a schoolwide project, and its funding is based on the unduplicated count of children below the 50th percentile in either reading or math.

Comparable databases for the comparison can only include:

- for reading, children in grades 2-4 whose pretest score was at or below the 30th %ile
- for math, children in grades 4-5 whose pretest score was at or below the 25th %ile.

Example 2:

A schoolwide project formerly served all children below the 40th percentile in reading and in math. However, gains from Year -3 and Year -2 were based on fall-spring testing, whereas annual testing was used from Year -1 on. Also, data processing eliminated any children in Year -1 who were absent more than 18 days or who had ever repeated a grade. This reduced the percent of students who had data from 72% in Year -3 and 70% Year -2 to 18% in Year -1.

The database needs to be reconstructed from cumulative folders so that comparable data are available on as many children as possible:

- for Year -3 and Year -2, complete annual gains from the cumulative folders
- for Year -1, compute annual gains for all children served regardless of attendance and retention in grade
- for Year +3, use annual gains only for children whose pretest score was below the 40th percentile

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT COMPARISON

Defining the Basis of the Comparison in the Same School

	Reading		Math	
	Percentile	*Grades*	*Percentile*	*Grades*
Sept. Year -3	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sept. Year -2	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sept. Year -1	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sept. Year +1	Schoolwide Project Began			
Sept. Year +2	(No Comparison Required.)			
Sept. Year +3	(No Comparison Required.)			
June Year +3	Do third year gains data exceed the average achievement gains of comparable educationally deprived children from the three years prior to implementation?			

AN EXAMPLE OF CALCULATION OF THE AVERAGE ACHIEVEMENT GAIN FOR COMPARABLE EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN FOR THE THREE YEARS PRIOR TO PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Step 1: Determine the lowest percentile in reading and math which was used for student selection in the three years prior to implementation.

Reading: 30th percentile
Math: 25th percentile

Step 2: For the students up to and including the percentile points identified in Step 1, multiply the average NCE gain by the number of students served (N) during the year.

	Reading			**Math**		
	Ave. NCE Gain	*N =*	*Total Ave. Gain*	*Ave. NCE Gain*	*N =*	*Total Ave. Gain*
Year -3	*-5*	*72*	*-360*	*-2*	*63*	*-126*
Year -2	*2*	*77*	*154*	*-6*	*60*	*-360*
Year -1	*0*	*80*	*000*	*1*	*50*	*50*
TOTAL		*226*	*-206*		*173*	*-436*

Step 3: *Sum the total average gains and divide by the number of students.*

Reading: *(-206) / (229) = (-.9)*
Math: *(-436) / (173) = (-2.52)*

Step 4: *Compare gains for Year +3 to the average gains from Step 3 above.*

SCHOOLWIDE PROJECT COMPARISON

DEFINING THE BASIS OF THE COMPARISON BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND THE LEA

Step 1: Extract data on students from schoolwide project up to the level used by the LEA for selection of Chapter 1 students throughout the district. For example, if the LEA had enough funds to serve only those students who scored at or below the 30th percentile in year +2 and at or below the 27th percentile in Year +3, the schoolwide project would use data on only those students for comparison purposes.

Step 2: From the LEA database extract data on students in the same grades as those served in schoolwide projects.

Step 3: Calculate average NCE scores in both reading and math for students selected in Steps 1 and 2.

Step 4: Subtract Year +2 scores from Year +3 scores.

Step 5: Compare gains calculated for schoolwide project to those of district as a whole.

	School		LEA	
	Year +2 .	Year +3	Year +2	Year +3
Percentile	*30	*27	30	27
Grades	2-6	2-6	**2-6	**2-6
Ave. NCE Reading				
Ave. NCE Math				

*Must be the same as LEA.
**Must be the same as Schoolwide Project being compared.

DESIRED OUTCOMES IN SCHOOLWIDE PROJECTS

While desired outcomes may be stated for the whole school, their evaluation **MUST** separate data for the educationally deprived and non-deprived children. The accountability requirements for all Chapter 1 schools require that the educationally deprived students make substantial progress toward meeting the desired outcomes. Both the aggregated data for desired outcomes and individual student's progress must be inspected.

The ***progress of pre-K, Kindergarten and Grade 1*** children should be evaluated through desired outcomes, since their achievement data are not aggregated with that of children in grades 2 and above. If a schoolwide project does not have one or more desired outcomes stated for the academic progress of the younger children, a desired outcome or two in this area should be added.